

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated January 12, 2005, claims 5, 18, and 19, have been canceled, and claims 1, 6-9, 14, and 20-22 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 6-17, and 20-26 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

### II. Claim Amendments

Applicants' attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for patentability or to distinguish the claims over the prior art.

### III. Information Disclosure Statement

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 22, 2004 was considered not in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.97 and 1.98 because the Shimada et al. reference was considered incomplete.

The Applicants requested another copy of the Shimada reference from the Technical Information Service of Purdue University. The full copy of the Shimada reference received was identical to the reference submitted, namely, the entirety of the Shimada reference was a cover sheet and two pages of an article. Since the full citation was submitted prior to the mailing date of the Office Action, the Applicants respectfully re-submit the PTO form 1449 for initialization by the Examiner.

### IV. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraphs (2)-(3) of the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beattie et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,947,421 (Beattie) in view of Meyer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,518,693 (Meyer) and Beattie et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,733,530 (Beattie2). However, in paragraph (4) of the Office Action, claims 5-13 and 19-26 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have rewritten the claims to incorporate the patentable subject matter of claims 5 and 19. This amendment was not made for reasons of patentability, since the subject matter of claims 5 and 19 were considered patentable over the cited references.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 14 are allowable over Beattie, Meyer, and Beattie2. Further, the remaining dependent claims are submitted to be allowable over Beattie, Meyer, and Beattie2 in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1 and 14 respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, the remaining dependent claims 2-13 and 15-26 recite additional novel elements not shown by Beattie, Meyer, and Beattie2.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center  
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
(310) 641-8797

Date: April 12, 2005

By: 

Name: Anthony J. Orler  
Reg. No.: 41,232

AJO/amb